



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 86

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (P. STAGG): Order, please.

HON. G.J. MURPHY (MINISTER OF SOCIAL SERVICES): Mr. Speaker, if I may make a point, perhaps I may call it of privilege with reference to an article appearing today in the "Daily News" Social Services Minister. And Murphy, disclosed nothing further had developed on that proposed special allowance for blind welfare recipients, allegedly because of federal government stinginess. To my knowledge, Sir, I did not say that nor would I like to have it implied because my dealings with the federal government have been very, very friendly indeed. Mark Lalonde is a perfect gentleman as the minister in charge.

I did say, because of the policy of the federal government because they look at the need and not the reason for the need. Stinaves, Sir, to my knowledge was never mentioned. If it was, if I did say that, I want to apologize for any inference against the federal government because as I say, I would like to add again, that all my dealings with them have been very friendly. They have been very decent as far as we are concerned and the Minister, Mr. Lalonde has always been very co-operative and very humane.

AN HONORABLE MEMBER: It is a good Liberal government.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

HON. DP. A.T. ROWE (MINISTER OF HEALTH): I would like to refer to an item in the "Daily News" this morning on the question of the vaccination which would cost five dollars for the kids. I think the impression they have been getting is that we were charging five dollars but the position is government

is paying a cost of five dollars per dose. There will be no cost to the individual who receives the immunization. I would like this point clearly understood.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

HON. A. J. MURPHY (MINISTER OF SOCIAL SERVICES): Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to a question asked yesterday with reference to short term assistance and the great growth in it. I thought I did not have the figures available but I said it had been way down except for the time of trawler strike in late July or early August. I have the figures here that I will table but just to give the House some idea, Sir, January 1973, the total number were 6,773; January 1974 the number of cases 5,443, a decrease of 1,300; February 1973, 4,842 cases; 1972, 4,232 cases, a decrease of 610 cases; in March 1973, 5,274 cases; in March 1972, 4,125 cases, a decrease of 1,149 cases; April 1973, 5,800 cases; April 1974, 5,156 cases, a decrease of approximately 650; May 1973, 5,498 cases; in 1974, 5,024 cases, a decrease of some 474; June 1973, 4,812; 4,262 cases in 1974, a decrease of approximately 550 cases; July, 4,287 in 1973; 1974, 4,396 cases, an increase of approximately 100; August, 4,456 in 1973; 4,910 in 1974, approximately 450 cases of an increase; September, 4,142 in 1973; 1974, 4,906, an increase of approximately 800; and October 1973, 4,438 and in 1974, 4,918, an increase of approximately 480.

These increases, Sir, as I pointed out yesterday were in a great matter due to the trawler strike that took place, I think, it was late July or early August and tremendous numbers of these people came to us for assistance. So I will table this in case anybody wants it but previous to that, Sir, we had a very, very marvellous record of keeping the short term able-bodied assistance cases down.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the minister was going to get me some information on recovery of assistance that was paid out to those who were on strike in the various categories. Does the minister have that information?

MR. MURPHY: I thought it was going to be tabled, Mr. Speaker.

HON. W. W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think we are on the item now answers to questions for which notice has been given, if the honourable member wishes to advance a question he should bring it in, in the oral question period and not at this time. I think, we have to adhere to that Your Honour in order to have some order and consistency.

MR. NEARY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable minister, Sir, completely misunderstood what is going on between the minister and myself now. Yesterday I gave the minister notice, the minister took notice of the question and promised me the information today.

AN HON. MEMBER: It was suppose to be put on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir. The minister promised me the information today, Sir. So all I am doing is asking the minister if he has the information?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, due to the question being asked, and I did not understand it fully, I asked that it be placed on the Order Paper so I could know what the ramifications were but if we are just talking of the trawler men, as the

"Daily News" says here again. There has been no recovery because of a letter received from the President of the Fisherman's Union asking that any collections back be delayed until the whole matter of the strike and the arbitration board would be settled. So this we have decided to do.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! While the honourable member for Bell Island has asked a question in the stage of the proceedings which is set aside for answers to questions and it has gotten through and he has gotten the answer to the question or at least, I am not sure, I was not listening closely.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: However, I think the honourable member could wait until the oral question period which is coming up, which was coming up very shortly after this portion set aside for answers to questions.

Are there any further answers to questions for which notice has been given?

The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. B. PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for Bell Island asked a question last week of me regarding the homes at Hovles Avenue and Whiteway Street, the number of units that are now being sold. There are 100 houses there, ninety-eight of which are up for sale. There are two, I will have to get the information on those two. They are not available right now. Ninety-eight of them are. Forty-seven of the people who live in those houses, in other words, forty-seven of the residents have been interviewed. Eight have replied and four have signed -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, I have some of the answer here but I can get a copy for the honourable member. The selling prices range from around \$23,000 a unit to \$28,000 to \$50,000 with a minimum down payment of five per cent. The financing being provided by the Federal-Provincial partnership included the same terms used under the assistant home ownership programme under which interest rates are reduced and cash assistance is given with mortgage payments for families who qualify on the basis of income. Any units not sold will be converted to subsidized rental units and rented on the basis of the rent to income scale which applies

generally to all subsidized rental housing. I will get a copy of that for the honourable member.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, being sold. The ones that are not being sold will -

MR. ROBERTS: You said the ones that will be converted to - they will remain as, is what you meant, eh? They are all subsidized rental units now.

MR. PECKFORD: Not all of the houses.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, that is what I want to know. They are so called full recovery units, so called.

MR. PECKFORD: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the word.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Are there any further answers to questions for which notice has been given?

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Health if he has received a petition signed by 1,800 residents of Bell Island to retain a certain doctor on Bell Island and if so what action the minister has taken on that petition?

DR. A. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it is true that a petition was received. It was merely asking for the retention of the doctor. This was part of it. There were other points in the petition asking they be provided with adequate medical services. The situation regarding medical services on Bell Island was outlined in a press release which I made on the fourth of December and the press release stated that the present senior medical officer resigned and was being replaced by another doctor. My responsibility in the department is to insure that the people of Bell Island are provided with competent medical services. In the opinion of myself and the officials the doctor who is now being appointed as a senior medical officer for Bell Island has had several years surgical experience and I think can well serve the needs of the area.

The concern about the present senior medical officer who has resigned is the fact that it was realized by him after he had resigned

that there was a period of some six months following which he would be entitled to a pension and I am now trying to seek some alternate ways in which he will not be deprived of this for which he has worked for the past nine years. As far as the medical surveys are concerned I think we have taken the necessary steps to fill the gap.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): The member for Labrador North.

MR. M. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. I wonder if the minister could tell the House what is the status on the land transfer from the military reserve in Goose Bay to crown lands so that the community of Goose Bay, Happy Valley can rightfully discharge their duties as a community council.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not up to date on this in the last three or four days because I just got back into the city two or three minutes ago but up to a couple of weeks ago my understanding was that a special committee was in negotiation with the federal authorities regarding the transfer and the

sum of money involved. So, I do not know if that enlightens the honourable member or if any other gentlemen on this side can further enlighten him. I was to a meeting about two or three weeks ago, at which time a committee was appointed representing officials from various departments involved, relevant departments. They were to meet with the federal officials regarding same. That is the latest information I have. If the honourable member wants to see me about it after or tomorrow, I will be only too happy to try to find out more.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transportation and Communications and in the absence of the Premier, I would like to address a question to the honourable the House Leader. Could the House Leader deny or confirm that the government aircraft was used to transport any delegates or anybody to and from the Progressive Conservative Convention held in Gander recently?

HON. W.W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): I think, Your Honour, that that question was ruled out of order at another period of time but the honourable member has stricken the fear of God in my heart when he gets up and he asks me questions like that. The answer is that I can neither confirm nor deny it.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, would the -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

That question may be more properly framed for the Order Paper, presented and considered at that time as to whether it is in order or not.

MR. F. ROWE: Another question for the honourable House Leader, Mr. Speaker. Would the House Leader undertake to table the log of the government aircraft for the last month? That is co-operation, Mr. Speaker. Something to hide no doubt.

A question to the honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing -

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! Order, gentlemen!

Gentlemen if you do not wish to be orderly, you can adjourn the proceedings.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Municipal Affairs and

Housing indicate whether or not he will authorize and pay for a plebiscite on school taxes for the St. John's Metro Area?

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have not received any written proposal from city council or any other municipality regarding such a financing. If such a request is submitted to the department, it will be given due consideration like all the other requests that come to the department.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot ask a question of the deposed minister so I will have to address my question to the honourable the Minister of Justice, the member for Burin. Did the minister or was there in fact a petition or did the minister support an 800 signature petition from St. Lawrence two years ago opposing the establishment of a school tax authority in that particular area and if he did so, Sir, if he supported that petition, would he care to rationalize his stand compared to his own government's stand now on school tax authorities?

HON. T.A. HICKMAN (MINISTER OF JUSTICE): That is a grand question. I want to answer that. I am delighted to answer it, Mr. Speaker, because I read the same item in the paper this morning. School tax in St. Lawrence was imposed in 1971 prior to the 1971 election. It was brought into effect prior to the 1971 general election when the honourable the member for St. John's North was not Minister of Education. I recall that there was some sort of a - not much of an issue. There was some very responsible discussion in the St. Lawrence area concerning school tax during July, August and September of 1971 or July and August anyway.

I was never asked to support it,

that is to support any opposition to it nor was I asked to favour it. The simple fact is that the very overwhelming majority of the people of the area supported it. If I had been asked, it would have been an issue. I believe there was an attempt to try and make an issue. My recollection is that both the gentlemen who ran against me in that election and myself took the position that if we were asked to come out publicly we would say, we supported it, the school tax.

We have seen in St. Lawrence some benefits flowing from it. You should be there now to see the magnificent new high school, a DREE high school with fifty per cent Government of Canada involvement and the other fifty per cent coming from the taxpayers of the province and from the school tax people in the St. Lawrence Area, going up. You would see the tremendous rewards and benefits that have flowed to the people of St. Lawrence as a result of the school tax. I would commend all people in St. John's who have a genuine interest in the education of their children and who are not politically motivated to take a look around the province and see the benefits that are accruing in the areas where they have school taxes.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education. Would the minister care to justify why poll taxes in various school tax authority areas of the province vary from say, forty dollars in St. Lawrence to say a proposed seventy-five dollars in the St. John's Area?

HON. G. R. OTTENHEIMER (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Speaker, I do not think really that this question is intended to justify or not to justify but to ask for government's policy or to ask for information, justify or not to justify, I presume that would be something which will be done in a debate on a particular subject. However, each school tax authority in relationship to its own needs and to the discussions it has with the school boards in the area finally agree upon the budget that the school tax authority will endeavour to raise and the particular rate of taxation. This is done by each authority and then they must

submit the rate of taxation for approval to the Minister of Education. But the reason they are different, they are different regions, they have different budgets, they in many cases have different needs and, in some cases, there are different abilities to pay and different kinds of population and tax basis. I think, it would be at present in Newfoundland where we do not have, in many areas, any assessments and in other areas, we do not always have uniform assessments that it would be very ill-advised to do it in a different way at this particular time.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker. Would this not mean that inequities would exist as far as the taxpayers are concerned in the various areas and also with respect to the revenue that would be received by the various school tax authorities in the different areas of the province?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the question is argumentative and debating rather than a question with respect for information or for government policy. If the honourable gentleman had the broad and sympathetic and well-founded knowledge and understanding of education that his illustrious father did, then he perhaps would not have asked such a question, I refer of course to Senator Rowe.

MR. E. ROWE: I am sorry I did not catch the tail end of the minister's statement, Mr. Speaker. I wish he would repeat it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I believe the honourable gentleman thought that I was being uncomplimentary - it will be printed tomorrow in Hansard in all its glory. It was to the effect that if the honourable gentleman had the same knowledge and understanding of the educational system in Newfoundland and the needs of the province, etc., that his illustrious father had then he probably would not have asked such a question because he would have the information already.

MR. F. ROWE: Well that is a twisting of words to say the least, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the minister had a meeting with the school tax authorities recently in Gander, I believe, Mr. Speaker, was there any indication at that

time that they are having difficulty in collecting the taxes in the Corner Brook Area and Gander Area and that these school tax authorities would just as soon wash their hands of the whole matter altogether.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no impression that in the Gander Area and in the Corner Brook Area, the school tax authorities wish to disband. That certainly was not the case at all. I am sure if the honourable gentleman wishes to ask the Gander School Tax Authority or the Corner Brook School Tax Authority if they wish to no longer continue that their answer would be quite to the negative.

With respect to difficulties collecting taxes - I imagine there are always some difficulties collecting taxes. I think the federal government has difficulty collecting income tax sometimes. The provincial government frequently has difficulties collecting sales tax and municipalities sometimes have difficulties collecting municipal tax. I have no doubt that school tax authorities sometimes have difficulties collecting school tax. This would appear to be an inherent trait in human nature.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate to this honourable House the amount of the arrears for each of the existing school tax authorities at the present time? If he does not have the information on hand now, would he undertake to table this information tomorrow?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): This question is one that requires detailed knowledge and I think it would be more properly framed for the Order Paper.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I would abide by the ruling of the Speaker.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, is it a fact that the collecting of defaulted payments -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Order, please!

The honourable member for St. Barbe North has the floor. Other honourable members are asked to observe the rule of silence while another member has the floor.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Is it a fact or is it true that the collecting of default

payments through the magistrates as far as school taxes are concerned, often yields settlements of two dollars or less per month, Sir, and is therefore logical to assume that it is costing more to collect the money than is being collected in this particular instance?

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. First of all the honourable member has not addressed his question to anyone. It is just up in the air, "Is it a fact -". Secondly, the question itself is argumentative. It suggests its own answer and it is in the nature and realm of debate rather than questioning and as such is out of order.

MR. F. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. On the first point that the House Leader made, I was obviously addressing my question to the Minister of Education. I apologize for not naming the Minister of Education.

I would suggest that the question was not argumentative. It was asking about a specific fact. Were defaulted payments being collected by magistrates amounting to only two dollars per month or less, therefore the amount collected was in fact less than the expenditure to collect it? A factual question, not argumentative at all. Is it a fact? Is it true.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, well certainly in the aggregate, the amount collected is quite in excess of any administrative costs. The average of administrative costs would be about eight or nine per cent. It would be about that. That information is being tabulated for the honourable gentleman now but that roughly speaking, without having the figures in front of me, is about what it would come to, about eight per cent.

With respect to particular judgements given by particular magistrates in any particular cases, surely the honourable gentleman would not think that I would have this knowledge here or elsewhere. That is not something with which the Department of Education, as such, is immediately concerned, what particular judgement might be given in a particular case by a particular magistrate and what his ruling might be. That would not be information which I would have or necessarily even be entitled to or should wish.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, Mr. Speaker, before we characters on this side become ministers, remind us to get some legal training so we can wessel our way out of questions being asked in the House of Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Order, please!

The point raised by the honourable the House Leader about the honourable members framing of his previous question was quite correct. Then the honourable member when he reframed his question had a question that was in order. The honourable member is not permitted to get up and make speeches during the question period. If he is dissatisfied with an answer, there is an avenue through which he can approach this.

Of course the honourable member realizes that he can only have the floor during the question period to ask questions not to make speeches.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I probably will not need it. I am no longer being provoked, Mr. Speaker.

Since the Minister of Education promised to table the

budgets of the school tax authorities some time ago. Could he indicate to the House when he is prepared to do this?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the question that I was asked was not to table the budget, was to table the expenses of the various school tax authorities and that was about three sitting days ago, I would expect to have that within a few days.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The honourable Member for Bonavista North.

MR. P. S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Environment. In view of the fact that when Newfoundlanders travel to the Mainland they have to have their cars sprayed at Port aux Basques, has the minister made any representation to either the federal government or the C.N.R. themselves to also have the cars sprayed that are coming from the Mainland to Newfoundland, because, you know, disease is a two-way traffic?

HON. W. G. DAWE (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT): Mr. Speaker, that has nothing to do with environment whatsoever, that is agriculture. It is the Federal Department of Agriculture to whom the question should be directed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. THOMS: Well the minister is shirking his responsibilities then.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! The honourable member is also drawn to the rule, that he is not permitted to make speeches during the question period.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, could I direct a question to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. For some years now the Power Commission and the other power interests in the province have sprayed their lines with some kind of an insecticide that have killed the plants under the lines. I wonder if the minister could tell this honourable House if this policy of these companies will continue or is the government going to step in and have this practice altered?

HON. H. COLLINS (MINISTER OF FORESTRY AND AGRICULTURE): Mr. Speaker, that is a practice which was started some years ago and has been

permitted to continue for a good number of years. From an astatic point of view, I suppose, it is undesirable. Just what the ill affects might be in terms of the forestry resource, I am not sure but it is certainly something that I will take under advisement and will look into.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: A question to the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate how much money is being collected through school assessments now in the area of what would be the St. John's School Tax Authority and how this would compare to the amount that would be collected through a poll tax by the school tax authority? (Based on the seventy-five dollars.)

MR. OTTENHEIMER: In rough figures, Mr. Speaker, the amount which would be collected, let us say, this year in assessments, in a twelve month period of assessments because assessments now are fifteen dollars a month, so it is \$150 a year for assessments, so under assessments approximately \$2 million. Under the proposal of the school tax authority the amount which will be collected will be approximately \$4.1 million. It is about double, roughly speaking, the difference between around \$2 million and about \$4 million.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is going to be hard on the merchants.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: What is wrong with the political pigmy over there?

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Public Works.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! This is not directed at the honourable Member for St. Barbe North. I am finding it rather difficult to hear questions from the honourable members who today just happen to be fairly long distance from the Chair, so I ask honourable members to my left and some honourable members to my right

if they would observe the rule of silence for my sake, if not for the sake of the honourable members to my right or left.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Public Works. In view of the fact that Mr. Brian Riley of Trizec has stated that negotiations are still going on with the government with respect to the granting of office space and the Premier has stated the exact opposite in this honourable House, I was wondering if the minister could clarify the situation?

HON. DR. T. FARRELL (MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS): The Premier did not say, Your Honour, in answer to the question, he did not say the exact opposite, he said that preliminary agreements or negotiations had terminated but not the negotiations which were still on-going. As I stated in the House the other day, they are still on-going and there were some negotiations since that date,

and that is where the matter lies at the present moment,

MR. MURPHY: I am very happy it is in St. John's Centre.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): The member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the acting Premier would care to comment on the latest unemployment figures released by Statistics Canada this morning showing that 3,000 more Newfoundlanders are unemployed this year as of the end of November last year?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Who is the acting Premier? Nobody.

MR. NEARY: Dumbfounded. Dumbfounded. Get up and say something, b'y! Look alive. Is the acting Premier going to answer the question?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Who is the acting Premier?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if these figures that the honourable gentleman just referred to are correct, we have never been satisfied as a government that we have gotten a true assessment of the unemployment picture in Newfoundland from Statistics Canada. If they are correct, then in my opinion, we are paying the tragic price in Newfoundland, indeed the four Atlantic Provinces are paying the tragic price of the federal policy that is more interested in fighting inflation in Ontario than maintaining a decent standard of living in the Province of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Would the acting Premier indicate to the House what plans the Provincial Government have to cope with this record unemployment in the Province at the present? Do they have any plans at all to deal with this tragic situation?

MR. HICKMAN: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. HICKMAN: I am not prepared to answer that question.

MR. NEARY: I do not suppose he is Premier, Sir. I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Energy whose seems to be so lippy over there this afternoon, Sir, would confirm or deny the fact that the Twin Falls operation near Churchill Falls down in Labrador has been closed down?

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the situation here is that the Twin Falls plant, the dam and turbines draw water from the same reservoir as does the Upper Churchill plant and there is no point in having, as a matter of fact

it would be inefficient to have both the Twin Falls plant and the Upper Churchill plant operating at the same time. There is no additional energy obtainable because there is only so much water in the reservoir which both plants draw on. So there is no advantage in terms of energy. The plant will still be there. The turbines will still be there. There may be possibilities in terms of increasing the water available to go through these plants. There may conceivably in the future be some advantage in restarting the Twin Falls plant but at the present time there is no efficiency and as a matter of fact there would only be a loss in operating efficiency to have both going at the same time.

MR. MURPHY: How many employees -

MR. NEARY: I wonder if the minister would indicate then if the government intends to dispose of any of the existing equipment at Twin Falls?

MR. BARRY: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all the equipment is not government's to dispose of. It belongs to the Twin Falls Power Corporation I believe. I am not sure if that is the correct name of the company, in which Churchill Falls Corporation holds a certain percentage of shares but in which also I.O.C. and Wabush Mines also hold shares so that it is not in government's power just to do what it wants with the equipment. It would have to be a decision of the Board of Directors of the Twin Falls Power Corporation. But I can say that, as I just mentioned, I do not conceive of anything being done to take out the turbines, for example, if this is the sort of thing that the honourable member is thinking of.

As I understand the situation, the plant will remain in place and could be operated at some future date.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister while he is on his feet, could tell us how many executives have resigned from the Churchill Falls Corporation at Churchill Falls in Labrador since the government takeover.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I can say, I cannot give the exact number or the exact names, but I can say that the only resignations that I have been aware of are those that were carried out at the time of the transferring of ownership from BRINCO to the Province of Newfoundland

and this government made the courageous, tremendous and magnificent step of buying back control of the resources of Labrador which the previous administration had given away.

MR. MURPHY: Hear! Hear! "Leo"! Hear! Hear! "Leo"! All guts! All guts!

MR. BARRY: At that time, Mr. Speaker, there was an agreement between the government and BRINCO with respect to certain employees who had indicated that they wished to remain with BRINCO. Now they were very few and they were some of the upper executive, some of which I should mention, Mr. Speaker, had duties with BRINCO other than those connected with the power project. I can -

MR. NEARY: How about the general manager down there? Has he resigned too?

MR. BARRY: Oh! No, no, no, no.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would let me go for a moment, I can say that we have been very fortunate and that it is an example I think of the good planning that went into this arrangement that we were able to maintain -

MR. NEARY: By the former Liberal administration.

MR. BARRY: That we were able to maintain the services of the key employees and that for example, Mr. Jack Beaver who has done an excellent job as manager on the site initially at Churchill Falls, that we have persuaded or managed to persuade Mr. Beaver to remain in the employment of the now government controlled corporation, that Mr. Beaver is at present President and Chief Executive Officer of Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation and is doing an excellent job from all reports that I have received. Other chief personnel, financial people for example who were on the BRINCO payroll at the time of transfer, have come over to remain with Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation and from all reports that I get, Mr. Speaker, the corporation is operating in a magnificent fashion.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I assume from the minister's answer that there is no foundation to the reports that the general manager down at the Churchill Falls has resigned recently, no foundation to these reports.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if it is, it is something that I have not been made

aware of as of this moment. Now, it may be, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member is referring to the fact that Mr. Beaver is no longer the on site operations manager at Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation. He in his capacity as President and Chief Executive Officer is operating for a time out of the head office of the corporation that is in Montreal. Now I am not sure if that is what has lead to the speculation.

MR. NEARY: Well, would the minister mind explaining that. Elaborate on what is happening there in rearranging personnel, key personnel down there.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, again this is an aspect of the takeover from BRINCO that required an involved - an awful lot of behind the scenes work. I think if you went through this you would see just how complicated an operation is such as the one we undertook last spring. You just do not take a corporation like that. Sure you can do that as far as legal title is concerned but you also have to have a properly operating corporation once you obtain the ownership of it. So this means that you require transfer of personnel and you cannot just tell personnel, "You are no longer here, you are there." People are people. You have to treat them like people. Fortunately they no longer have to be in the position where their lives are run for them by somebody else. So you have to attract personnel, Mr. Speaker. You have to negotiate and bargain,

bargain and this was done.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Just a second now. With respect to the honourable member's latter question, this is another aspect that the Churchill Falls, Labrador Corporation, the personnel, the accounting mechanisms and so on. They were all interrelated with BRINCO's personnel and with BRINCO's bookkeeping systems and so on so that there was a very long and involved process of separating out the two, Mr. Speaker, of separating the personnel and the records and so on that were needed for Churchill Falls, Labrador Corporation from those that were needed by BRINCO and related to BRINCO solely.

This was done, Mr. Speaker, by moving the CFLCo personnel into a separate office, into their own suite of offices in Montreal separate, completely separate from the BRINCO offices. Over a period of time - pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Under Mr. Groom.

MR. BARRY: Under Mr. Groom, the Chairman of the CFLCo Corporation. Over a period of time this has been done, Mr. Speaker. The personnel from the Montreal office, the records and so on have been separated from those belonging to the BRINCO Corporation. This is where Mr. Beaver now carries on his operations.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

The honourable minister could go on at length in answering this question. We have gone five minutes beyond the question period now. So, I have to call Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Motion (1) - the debate on the amendment or the proposed amendment was adjourned by the member for St. Barbe North I believe.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, we are debating an amendment moved by my colleague the member for Twillingate which essentially asks that this House approve of the final report of the commission set up to establish electoral boundaries in this province. That is the essence of the amendment, fifty-one seats but based wholly and solely on the final recommendations of

the commission set up to report to the government.

Now, Sir, if this government is one of principle, if it is a government of conviction of its own words, if it is a government of integrity and, Sir, if it is a government of moral and political honesty and indeed of consistency, the whole of the government on the other side of this honourable House has no other choice but to support this particular amendment.

Sir, if the words uttered in this House mean anything, especially when they are coming from the honourable the Premier who is not in his seat today and the honourable the Minister of Justice who may be considered to be the two top political figures in this province, the Premier and the Minister of Justice, if their words in this honourable House are to mean anything, there should be a unanimous vote in favour of this particular amendment.

Now, Sir, we cannot dispute the, I will say, right but I really mean the power, we cannot dispute the right or the power of this government to do anything. The government with its legislative majority can do anything in this honourable House within the rules of the House. Sir, I can see honourable members if they ever get the intestinal fortitude to stand up on the other side and speak to this particular resolution - we have not seen this, Sir, just two members speaking to the original resolution, nobody so far on the amendment, and the Premier the other day ready to close debate without any members on the other side standing up. If any members do stand up on the other side of the House, I can almost forecast what they are going to say with respect to this amendment. They are obviously going to go against it.

Sir, they will probably say that Magistrate Gordon Seabright, a member of the Electoral Boundaries Commission supports redistribution as legislated or as brought in by the government in this resolution. Sir, that is not the fact.

MR. MARSHALL: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: That is right. I am speculating the defence that the government may take. The fact of the matter is that Mr. Gordon Seabright does not support

December 10, 1974

Tape 2013

IB-3

the resolution that was brought in by the government. He simply said that the government has acted properly in making changes in the redistribution bill. Acting properly means that they have the legal right to make these

changes. The government can make any change they think is necessary in the Redistribution Bill according to the terms of reference of the bill." That is correct. "It is clearly understood by the commission that the government might accept, reject or change any recommendations made." That is absolutely correct.

Mr. Seabright stated that the government have the right to implement or not to implement recommendations of any commission. Now, Sir, that is absolutely correct. The government can vote the opposition out of this House of Assembly anytime they wish. They can expel them out on a point of order with their legislative majority. Sir, what we are talking about over here is the moral right, the moral obligation of the government to stick by the final report of the royal commission.

Sir, as I said, there is nothing illegal in what the government have done, they have the right to do it. But, Sir, does the word of the Premier and do the words of the Minister of Justice mean anything in this honourable House? If they do mean anything what the government have done is grossly immoral. It is a brazen turn about on the part of the government and it is a sudden reversal -

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order please! Order please!

The phrase I just detected as it was going by there, grossly immoral, certainly is unparliamentary, uncalled for and I suggest the honourable member might rephrase his remarks. Certainly rephrase his remarks.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I shall be only too happy to rephrase my remarks. What the government have done, Sir, is shameful! Grossly shameful! It is a brazen turn about, Sir, and it is a sudden reversal of the principles that the government articulated when they brought in the bill to establish the - honourable members opposite find it hilarious, Mr. Speaker. It goes to show their concern for the recommendations -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. F.B. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask for one simple ruling and that is that I have the right to be heard in silence during the period in which I am speaking.

It is obvious that in bringing in the resolution and making thirty-one changes in the final report submitted by the Electoral Boundaries Commission, and what they have had to say on it before, the government have reversed their stand on the principle that they announced during the previous debate on bringing in the bill to set up the commission in the first place. It is a case of the government saying one thing last year and doing something quite the opposite this year.

Now, Sir, in these times of Watergate-

AN HON. MEMBER: What does that have to do with it?

MR. F.B. ROWE: It has a lot to do with it, Mr. Speaker. Politicians should be kind of sensitive about their own ending.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. F.B. ROWE: Sir, we are, and I am suggesting this very seriously, always suspect, we are always accused of saying one thing and meaning another, we are accused of being hypocrites and hypocritical at times or being ruthless and even crooked. We are accused quite often of stooping to any level to gain a vote.

This may be a common feeling amongst some segments of the electorate but, Sir, I tend to think that there are honourable members on both sides of this House, most members on both sides of this House who are members of very high principle, high moral standards and of high integrity. They are trying their best to serve this province. Sir, are these men going to sit idly by and watch their own integrity and watch their own principles and their own motives be tarnished and eroded away because of the misleading and deceiving statements made by the honourable the Premier and the honourable the Minister of Justice approximately one year ago?

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order please! The phrase "deceiving statements" is unparliamentary. The honourable member may say what he means in other words and I ask him to do that.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a point of clarification: If I may ask the Speaker, I will abide by the Speaker's ruling but for a point of information, even if it is true is it unparliamentary to say that something is misleading and deceiving if in fact it is true?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. F.B. ROWE: It is still unparliamentary?

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Look, the honourable member knows or ought to know that it is not parliamentary to question the integrity or the honesty or the honour of an individual member in the House or any group of members in the House be they on this side or be they on that side. He is entirely and absolutely out of order. He is out of order under the rules of this House, the House of Commons and every other House in the Western Democracy.

He has been going on, Your Honour, talking about integrity, deceit, deception, immorality and all of these statements and I would suggest, Your Honour, that he be directed to rephrase and refrain from using these words in future in this debate. Not only in this debate but the few other little debates, very few, that he will be participating in in the future.

MR. F.B. ROWE: To that point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. F.B. ROWE: Am I allowed to speak to the point of order raised by the House Leader, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order please!

MR. MARSHALL: Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I called upon the honourable member to rephrase his remarks earlier. The honourable member rose on what he termed a point of clarification which I do not think appears anywhere in the rules. I suggested that to the honourable member that the phrases that he had used were unparliamentary and I suggest to him now that he rephrase or retract.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I will rephrase the statement and I will simply say that I was misled when I heard the statements of the Premier and the honourable the Minister of Justice and I reread the Hansard of one year ago and when I witnessed the resolution that was brought into this House a few days ago. I personally was misled or I - I was misled, it is as simple as that. I am not suggesting that the Premier nor the Minister of Justice deliberately misled this House or deceived the House or the people of Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, (but I would prove my point without having to use the words) I am not particularly worried

about the individual politicians in this particular instance. What I am worried about is the whole attitude of society or of the people of Newfoundland towards the democratic government that we have in this province. Sir, their attitudes towards democratic government depends on the integrity and the honesty and the consistency and the willingness of individual members in this House to act according to the promises and the commitments and the words that they utter in this House, especially, Sir, when they are actually uttered in this honourable House and they are recorded for posterity.

Sir, the major spokesmen, the Premier and the Minister of Justice, gave an undeniable commitment on a number of occasions that they would take out of the hands of government the responsibility for drawing up electoral boundaries. Even the Minister of Education - Mr. Speaker, is there any chance of getting a drink of water around here? Sir, the main spokesmen gave undeniable commitments that they would take out of the hands of government the responsibility for drawing up the electoral boundaries in this province.

Sir, they said that they would accept the final report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission. Sir, they said that they would end gerrymandering forever. Sir, these were the promises made by the honourable the Premier, the honourable Minister of Justice and even the Minister of Education, the leader of the youth in this province.

Sir, in the Address in Reply, on April 25, 1972 the Minister of Education took considerable time in his speech in the Address in Reply to refer to the setting up of electoral boundaries in this province. "We wish to put an end to gerrymandering and such an independent commission will put an end to gerrymandering."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: And I am going to say it for 20,000 more times in this House and publicly until the people of Newfoundland realize what a bunch of hypocrites, political hypocrites we have on the other side.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Another quote, Mr. Speaker, from the Minister of Education who has yet to speak on this amendment or on this resolution.

"The only thing that we of the administration can take credit for is that in our first election to office, we irrevocably, irretrievably put an end to this kind of political skulduggery by stating in the Speech from the Throne the government's intention and policy to establish an independent commission and that obviously is binding on us, an independent commission whose report, Sir, is binding on the government." The government have retracted from that particular position completely.

Sir, the Minister of Justice said that it was a very historic occasion, that the electoral boundaries were now the responsibility of a commission. He stated that there were very few parliaments within the British Parliamentary system that had this yet. The honourable the Minister of Justice said that.

I would suggest another quote from the Minister of Justice, Sir, who has yet to utter a word in this debate. "I would suggest to this honourable House that no responsible minister and no responsible commission would tolerate nor would it be possible for there to be any change in any report that comes from the commission." Sir, the government has taken this report and slashed it into thirty-one districts, changed it drastically in some districts and discriminated, in some cases, against rural Newfoundland for whom this government is supposed to stand.

I would like to hear the honourable the Minister of Justice get up and rationalize his previous statements in this debate and say what he thinks of his own administration now after taking this commission report and changing it in thirty-one places.

Another quote from the minister, Mr. Speaker. "I would suggest that this legislation will convince the people of Newfoundland that we, as a government, and that, we as a House of Assembly, are determined once and for all, to do away with any suggestion that there can be any gerrymandering as far as electoral boundaries are concerned and voting patterns in Newfoundland." Let the honourable minister get up and explain what he meant by that.

The honourable minister also suggested that rural Newfoundland still requires a great deal of representation and a very high proportion

of representation in the House. Yes, Sir, he - well he has not defended but he can stand by and allow that mess to pass in this House of Assembly that has been created on the Great Northern Peninsula and in the White Bay District and Baie Verte District.

Sir, the honourable Premier himself said that what we are doing is bringing in a Redistribution Bill that is fair, that is impartial and that will do the job for which it was set out to do and designed to do. Yet, the honourable the Premier takes that commission report down on the eighth floor and mutilates it, rapes it of most of the recommendations that were in it.

The beaut, Sir, the beaut - "The past government, Sir, could be blamed, I think, for some legitimacy"(whatever that means)"of gerrymandering." Whatever the language is here. "The past government, Sir, could be blamed I think, for some legitimacy of gerrymandering seats." A criticism coming from the honourable the Premier. To end the quote - "Which I do not think should ever happen again in this province." Yet, the honourable the Premier has the political hypocrisy to turn around and take this impartial, nonpartisan report from the commission and completely change it about.

The honourable the Minister of Justice, Sir, back to the honourable Minister of Justice - I hope I am successful in getting him to his feet, Sir, to answer some of the phrases that he uttered in this House of Assembly one year ago. "It is the principle of this bill and it is the view of this government that the formula and the procedure set forth in this, is by far the most nonpartisan way of arriving at the appointment of a commission that will be totally free of political pressures and political partisanship."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Is that true?

MR. F. ROWE: Absolutely true, Sir, as far as it goes, except that the government took that report and then gerrymandered it, engineered it, redesigned it, repainted it, redrew the boundaries and the minister saying this is not hypocrisy. "This is not misleading," he asks me, "This is not deceiving."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, it is not deceiving.

MR. F. ROWE: Not deceiving, not misleading? I am asking a question, Mr. Speaker.

December 10, 1974

Tape 2016

IB-4

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: It is just as well, there were no questions answered.

Sir, another quote from the honourable the minister, "Any

resolution, Sir, coming before this House which would seek in any way, "listen to this, Sir, 'coming before this House which would seek in any way to change the commission's report would, I suggest, have to be on very sound and valid grounds indeed. It is most unlikely that there will ever be a resolution coming before this House' if the minister would stop mumbling and listen to this one." "It is most unlikely that there will ever be a resolution coming before this House other than one to adopt the report." Now the minister has the opportunity to get up and act according to his principles and his own words and support that amendment, because that amendment says exactly what the Minister of Justice said one year ago. "It is most unlikely that there will ever be a resolution coming before this House other than one to adopt the report." So here is the minister's chance. He can get up and stand on principle and stand on his words spoken and support this particular amendment.

One last quote, Sir, from the Hon. Minister of Justice. "But it is significant that following the passing of this resolution" (that is the resolution for the commission) "Government is then obligated to bring in a bill in implementing such a resolution." Well boy, if that is right and if the final resolution brought in is supposed to be consistent with that statement there is some fancy playing around with words, Sir, I submit. Because I was left with the complete understanding that the final report of the commission would be accepted by this honourable House and accepted by the government. Every single quote that I have used this afternoon, uttered by the Hon. Minister of Education, the Minister of Justice and the Hon. Premier are accurate, they are in the verbatim reports to be read and they are the exact opposite of what this government have done with respect to the electoral boundaries, in this province. Exactly opposite.

Now, Sir, I do not know how to state it and still be parliamentary but I was deceived. I was misled. I submit that there is a possibility that others are in the same boat because there were thirty-one chances

made in this electoral map after the final report of the royal commission. Sir, these were reckless changes. How can the people of this province have any faith or any belief at all in democratic government, when they cannot believe the words uttered by the Hon. Premier, the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Education?

Sir, I have a great deal of respect for the honourable Member for St. John's South who publicly, Sir, on radio or television or on one of the electronic media, publicly stated that every member is obliged to get up and speak on this resolution. How come the honourable Member for St. John's South has not spoken, Sir? Has he been muzzled? Has he been told to shut up? The Minister of Justice agrees with me, Sir. Muzzled and shut up!

Sir, what about the honourable Member for St. John's North. The honourable Member for St. John's North who was fired out the Portfolio of Education for his principles, has not seen fit to stand up and speak in this debate. It is no good for the honourable member to say, sit down. I will sit down when my time is up. The honourable members on the other side have had ample opportunity to stand up as soon, Sir, -(Have you noticed the plot, Sir?) as it is seen by the Hon. Premier that one of the members of the opposition is not ready to jump to his feet, the Hon. Premier is ready to jump to his feet thereby muzzling his own colleagues.

I invite the honourable Member for St. John's North to speak directly after me.

MR. A. CARTER: If the honourable gentleman would sit down I would get up and speak.

MR. F. ROWE: I will sit down when I am finished my speech.

Sir, what about the honourable Member for Bonavista South, the member who is so concerned over human rights, civil rights in this province. We will expect him, Sir, to speak on this amendment. He is at least one person who had, I would not say gall, who had the courage to get up and speak on the main resolution. I did not agree with his speech but that is fair game but he had the courage to stand up.

The Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy got up and threw a temper tantrum but the only speech that we heard was from the honourable Member for Bonavista South.

Sir, I would like to hear from the Minister of Education, to get up and speak on this. And, Sir, most of all, of course, the Minister of Justice to try and defend, Sir, his political split personality because that is what it must be. How he can tolerate this kind of action in the House at this time after the quotes that are attributed to him, is something that I cannot comprehend and indeed, most Newfoundlanders cannot comprehend.

Sir, it is a sad and dismal day when we cannot trust the words of the two top politicians in this province. Sir, it almost destroys the essence of - the minister is making a grand speech there in his seat, Sir, I hope he can do the same thing on his feet.

MR. HICKMAN: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a ruling that I be heard in silence, please.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please! The honourable gentleman for St. Barbe South -

AN HON. MEMBER: North!

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): North, has a right to be heard in silence. I would also suggest at this time that he would become relevant to the topic at hand.

MR. F. ROWE: I had not realized that I had strayed away from the relevancy of the topic, Mr. Speaker. I believe I have approximately ten minutes left -

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Seven minutes left.

MR. F. ROWE: Seven minutes to be exact but I will not consume all the

time of the House merely to say that we have to have honourable members on the other side of the House get up, I know it is a difficult job, Mr. Speaker, get up and try to defend their stand one year ago when they promised this House, when they promised all the people of Newfoundland that they would accept the recommendations of the final report of the commission to set up the electoral boundaries in this province.

"It will be binding" certain honourable ministers said, Sir. Sir, I can point out instances where this government has gerrymandered these seats and discriminated against rural areas of Newfoundland.

Sir, for example; if you take the Avalon Peninsula seats, there are approximately twenty of them, the average population is 9,284. The Avalon Peninsula, twenty seats, the average population 9,284. Below the average no less. Below the average. Yet, in the four northeast coast districts that they propose, the Straits of Belle Isle, Humber-St. Barbe, Baie Verte-White Bay and the Humber Valley, the average population is 11,289. Now, Sir, what kind of sense is that? When the government paraded around this province in 1971 and 1972 with crocodile tears suggesting how concerned they were for rural Newfoundland, yet they give this part of rural Newfoundland completely unmanageable seats, Sir. It is discrimination. The government have not acted according to their stated principles in this House.

They have said, many of them, that they will accept, that the final report will be binding. Now is their opportunity to do so and do as we will on this side, support this resolution calling for the adoption of the final report of the commission so ably moved by my colleague from Twillingate and I would expect to see honourable members on the other side of the House support this petition and at least speak up on the issue. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dunphy): The honourable Member for Trinity North:

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to enter into

this debate at all. After listening to the honourable Leader of the Opposition yesterday - maybe I should say the leader by default - I felt that I should get up and have something to say. Maybe he goaded me into it, I do not know. I did not partake in the debate on the resolution because I was in favour of it. However, I would like to say at the outset, Sir, that I am bitterly opposed to the amendment as brought in by the opposition.

Now, I do not want to be irrelevant here, but the honourable Leader of the Opposition yesterday made reference on several occasions as have other members on the other side that we are muzzled over here. Now, I am not surprised that they talk like this. I guess they were muzzled so long themselves that they feel that we are automatically muzzled as well. So, before I get into my few remarks let me assure them, Sir, that there is nobody muzzled over here. There is nobody told when to stand up or sit down or what to say or when to say it. As a matter of fact, sometimes I think probably we might be a little bit better off if we were muzzled sometimes.

MR. NEARY: Hold on until Evans comes back.

MR. BRETT: We might have to muzzle him.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. BRETT: Now, Mr. Speaker, if anyone in our caucus was opposed to the commission's report it was me. I am not suggesting for one second that the commission did not do a good job. However, they being honourable men, of course, we expected them to bring in a good report. However, there was one part of their terms of reference that I feel was overlooked, obviously overlooked, and that was the community of interest.

Now, my remarks will be directed mostly to the changes as they affected my district. Now, I am not suggesting that the map that we brought in is perfect. I would be crazy to suggest that. I am sure, Sir, that every member of this House realizes that if we changed one district, then it became necessary to change almost every other one. We have had to change thirty-one. I am surprised that we did not have to change all of them.

Now, somebody mentioned one of the members of the commission

earlier this afternoon in the person of Magistrate Seabright. I am very familiar with the gentleman, Sir. I was teaching school at Botwood when he took his Grade XI in the Salvation Army School there. I know that Mr. Seabright is a very honourable man. I am sure that he wished to bring in a good report. He did bring in a good report. It was unfortunate that we, because of request, had to change some of it.

Now, some of the members -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: We had to do it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, no.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. BRETT: That is all right. I do not mind them, Sir.

Some of the members on the opposition side keep referring to the changes - I think the member from Bonavista North - He said that they were made in the dead of night down on the eighth floor. How stupid and ridiculous. So what if they were made in the dead of the night or in the nude day? What do you expect us to do, pick up the phone and say, "Eddy, 'Stevie' baby we are changing some of the recommendations of the royal commission. Come on over. We want you to help us"? Do not be so crazy. It would make you sick.

Sir, I do not know if they want to believe the fact that we did have representation from several districts in Newfoundland. I do not know if there was any representation from the Liberal districts or not but I can assure you, Sir, that there were many, many from mine. Now, I had letters - I do not know how many, it could have been six, seven, eight or ten, I do not know. Not a lot but I did have some letters. I do not think I received any petitions. I received letters particularly from the Town Councils on the Bonavista Peninsula, that is the Trinity Bay side.

These councils were not aware of the fact that the commission would be having a hearing in Clarendville. They did not know that they could present briefs and request that changes be made. Now, a lot of people have been referring to the second report of the commission. There is no such a thing as the second report. There was only one.

However after the commission's report had been brought in and word got out to my district of the changes and particularly the town councils on the Trinity Bay side of the Bonavista Peninsula, they started to protest immediately and to write letters. Now I am not absolutely sure what I did with the letters, if I gave them to the Minister of Justice or if I sent them to the Chairman of the Commission but I can assure you I received them. I do not have them in my files right now.

Now in talking about the commission there is another point that I want to make, Sir, and that is this: in the beginning I agreed wholeheartedly with the setting up of the commission. Of course, I did but I state now categorically, Sir, "That no commission" (and I am going to read this) "should have the right to dictate to a government exactly what a particular piece of legislation should contain." The government in power whether it be - the Member for Bell Island has a big grin on his face over there behind the Speaker's Chair.

MR. NEARY: I am smiling at the Minister of Education.

MR. BRETT: Oh, that is good! The government in power, Sir, whether it be the Liberal Government, the Progressive Conservative Government or any other party, I think, that they should most certainly have the final say in what goes into a piece of legislation.

Sir, we are elected to govern this province and we must accept that responsibility as we must also accept the credit or the criticism of our actions. Now I reiterate, Sir, I want to make this point very clear that we have a responsibility to govern and we are not going to be dictated to by a rather frustrated opposition. Frustrated, I think, because some of the changes may - oh, they just might have an effect on some of them getting elected again. I am sure some of them are very upset over that.

Now, Sir, I am talking to the amendment, therefore, that takes me back to the original report of the commission. Now let me tell you what was recommended for Trinity North. This was there

suggestion. First of all, they wanted to change the name to Clarenville. I was very much against that but that is what they wanted to do. The district would start, (this is the recommendation of the commission now) would start at George's Brook that is a small settlement just outside of Clarenville, then it would take in all the settlements from George's Brook to Clarenville, including all the settlements on Random Island and also all the settlements in Southwest Arm, on both sides of the Arm that is, down to St. Jones and Hatchet Cove on one side and then the small settlements of Hillview, Deep Bight, Northwest Brook. Also that the boundaries would extend pushing me east out to Sunnyside and then they wanted me to jump across into Placentia Bay and to take in Arnolds Cove, Come-by-Chance, and then part of the way down the Burin Peninsula into Swift Current, North Harbour and Garden Cove.

Now the commission further recommended that all the settlements in the district from - listen to this one, this is a good one. All the settlements from Elliston to Bonaventure would come out of Trinity North to be put into Bonavista South. Now any Newfoundlander who has half a wit knows of the ill-feeling that exists between the bays in this province. It is unfortunate but it does exist. They wanted to take all of the communities on the Trinity Bay side of the Bonavista Peninsula, that is from Bonaventure down to Elliston - actually what they did, they drew a line across the peninsula, and they said, this is going to be Bonavista South. I think, you probably had more settlements in Trinity Bay than there were in Bonavista Bay and yet it was going to be called Bonavista South. Now you do not have to be very smart to see that, that could not possibly work and that there was no community of interest whatsoever in this world. It was absolutely ridiculous.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: I am not concerned with Baie Verte/White Bay, I am talking about my - well this is exactly what most of you have done, you have been mainly concerned with your own districts.

MR. ROBERTS: I have been concerned with the whole province.

MR. BRETT: Yes, he has every right to be concerned, Sir. He has every right to be concerned.

MR. ROBERTS: Come on boy, keep it up! A Gerry Korbai ruling now.

MR. BRETT: As I was saying, Sir, these changes - I am like Rossie Barbour now, I have my notes lost. As I was saying, Sir, that these councils -

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. BRETT: These councils on the Bonavista Peninsula, on the Trinity Bay side, were not aware that they could present briefs and they were not aware of the changes until after it was too late, then they did make representation.

MR. ROBERTS: Will the gentleman table a copy of them?

MR. BRETT: No, I already - why does he not listen to what I am saying?

MR. ROBERTS: Okay. All right. The honourable gentleman makes things up but he will not prove it.

MR. BRETT: Is he calling me a liar, Sir?

MR. ROBERTS: I am not, the honourable gentleman is proving he is a liar by his own mouth.

AN HON. MEMBER: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. W.W. MARSHALL: On a point of order!

MR. SPEAKER: I will remind honourable gentlemen here to my right that when a member is standing up and speaking from his seat he has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, on that point of order: The honourable the Leader of the Opposition said of the honourable the Member for Trinity North that he is proving that he is a liar from his own mouth. I would ask that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition - we cannot have that type of language, that type of accusation hurled across the floor of this House. It is done time and time again. It is a matter of some regret that it comes from the Leader of the Opposition. One would expect different conduct from the Leader of a party than that. I rise on a point of order and ask that the honourable Leader of the Opposition be asked to withdraw that unequivocally, without any qualifications.

MR. ROBERTS: Your honour may I speak to the point before Your Honour rules?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentlemen opposite have instructed him, Mr. Speaker, I did not call the honourable gentleman from Trinity North a liar. Whether or not I believe he is one is of no concern. He looked across the House and he said was I calling him a liar. I said no, I was not calling him a liar. I did say that in my opinion the words out of his own mouth had proven him a liar if that is unparliamentary.

AN HON. MEMBER (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: It would be unparliamentary to say what I think of that. If Your Honour rules that that is unparliamentary - but I do not think the honourable Member for Trinity North - I did not call him a liar. I cannot say that I do not think he is one but that is another story. I did not call him one. I merely said that in my opinion what he is saying in this debate proves out of his own mouth that he is a liar. If that is out of order, if Your honour so rules, I will gladly withdraw it, of course.

MR. SPEAKER (Dunphy): I think that was a worthy exchange that was going on during the course of the conversation. I think the honourable Member for Trinity North asked if he was being called a liar and I think you withdrew to that point. Actually there is no point of order unless

there is more to be added to it.

MR. BRETT: Okay, Mr. Speaker. If I may, I was trying to point out, Sir, up to this time that the changes in the districts did not show community of interest. If I may I would like to continue in this vein.

AN HON. MEMBER: Speak up.

MR. BRETT: As I said, Sir, (I think I did. If I did not I shall say it now) some of the changes may be undesirable. I am not suggesting that every one of them is perfect but changes had to be made and here I am repeating myself, in order to change one or two then it meant change quite a number.

Let me point out that the latest report, or the changes made by us if you like, let me point out to you what this will mean in the district that will remain Trinity North. The district will not extend from Catalina to Clarendville. This will take in all the communities in that area, all up the Bonavista Peninsula and the Trinity Bay side down to Burgoyne's Cove, Random Island and then as far as Clarendville.

This will mean that the settlements of Elliston, Billard's Cove and Little Catalina will now become part of Bonavista. I will be honest, I am not one hundred per cent satisfied with that. I think Elliston and Billard's Cove should go in with Bonavista because of the community of interest. This is where they trade, they have agreements with council, they use the same garbage dump etc. etc.

Little Catalina now probably trades more with the Catalina-Port Union settlements. However, you had to start somewhere and you have to stop somewhere. On the other end, Mr. Speaker, all the settlements east of Clarendville that were formerly part of Trinity North now become part of the new District of Bellevue. This again is in the best interest of the community.

We foresee, I think everybody here does, a fair sized town will grow up around the industrial complex at Come by Chance and in all probability

these communities and some of them I will admit do trade with Clarenville now but with this new town that is bound to spring up there, there interest will be more centered in the Come By Chance area.

So, this change that I agree wholeheartedly with, that we have brought in certainly points to community of interest much more than the previous one. I forgot to point out that the report of the commission - I do not know how many of you here, members on both sides of the House, over there and over here, if you are living in St. John's - as far as you people are concerned Newfoundland ends at the overpass out there. I say both sides of the House. So, if I speak about Burgoynes Cove, you do not know where that is any more than somebody in Timbuktu.

Burgoynes Cove, Harcourt and Monroe was included in the new District of Terra Nova. Now, where is the community of interest? What has Burgoynes Cove got in common with Glovertown or Terra Nova? So, obviously, Sir, this had to be changed. Now, I suppose I could go on ad nauseam like some of the people over there. I have never heard as much repetition in all my life. I am getting sick and tired of it. It is like somebody said just now, "Why do we not take it as read."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Did he say a reputation or repetition?

MR. BRETT: I suppose.

Now, they have brought in this amendment. Well, I think most of them, if not all of them, spoke to the resolution. I am sure that every one of them are going to speak to the amendment. It goes on and on and on. I do not know what they hope to gain by it. It is no wonder, Sir, that we cannot keep a quorum in the House. Every time I come in and sit down and I see one of them get up, I want to regurgitate. It is sickening, Sir, because you know exactly what they are going to say. As I said, it is the same thing over and over.

I have a suggestion to make and I know it is like throwing water before the wind. They are not going to listen to it. I would suggest, Sir, that they forget this nonsense instead of trying to keep this thing going and trying to keep their names in the press. They are not doing a very good job of it. I do not mind telling them. I think

the only people that are very concerned about this are the few on that side of the House. The press does not seem to be very concerned about it. The people out in my district are not very concerned about it and in many of the other districts in which I have some liaison.

MR. NEARY: Come over till we show you some of the letters we are getting from the districts.

MR. BRETT: Oh, I bet. Yes, I bet. You are always getting letters. You must be one of the busiest men in the House.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: Do you want this one too?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yes, sure.

MR. BRETT: Anyway, Sir, this government is anxious to get on with some of the important issues that are facing this province. I ask them, Sir, to cut out this nonsense and let us get on with the important things that are facing the province.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I only have a few words to say on the main resolution. I cannot let it pass without saying a few words on the amendment. I was not in the House yesterday when the second amendment was made.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

I would like to remind the gentlemen opposite -

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour has called order.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

They are aware of the rules and when a member is speaking he has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, it has nothing to do with the gentleman from Bonavista South. Let me make that quite clear. It is the gentleman from Trinity North who is over there barely able to contain himself. It is really too much.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): The rule of the House still prevails regardless of who is speaking.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I agree. I think the member should speak in silence.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will go back again. In March, 1974 this House

of Assembly passed an act. It passed a piece of legislation asking for fifty-one seats.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That was March, 1973.

MR. MORGAN: March, 1973. We passed an act. It was voted on unanimously. I will say it again, voted on unanimously by all members of this legislature. The last part of that bill - I will read it. We all should read the bills when we vote on them and pass them in the House.

Section (21), Implementation of Report: "If the House of Assembly, by resolution,

(a) approves; or

(b) approves with alterations".

What are we doing now? We are approving with alterations - a bill that was passed by all members of this legislature in March, 1973. So, the opposition members came back in the House of Assembly three weeks ago or less than three weeks ago when we opened this fall session and they said that we changed our minds, and rightly so. I guess all politicians and all people have a right to change their minds. "They changed their minds", they said, 'we no longer want fifty-one seats in this legislature in this province. We only want forty-two. We are against increasing the number of seats in this legislature."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, that was less than two weeks ago we came in the House and the opposition and all the people in the province heard the Liberal Party officially say, "We are opposed to fifty-one

seats. We only want forty-two." Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the same opposition, the same Liberal Party pronounced to all Newfoundland, "We have changed our mind again. We are going back to fifty-one again." Seven months ago they wanted fifty-one. Two weeks ago they wanted forty-two. Yesterday they wanted fifty-one again.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of political hypocrisy is going on in this legislature. How can members of this government sit here and listen to this kind of hypocrisy over and over every day.

MR. ROBERTS: There is no leadership obviously, no leadership.

MR. MORGAN: The people of the Province, yesterday I was driving back from my district, I had two passengers in the car not from my district, and I hear the 5:45 p.m. news, "The opposition introduces amendment to the legislature asking that the report of the royal commission on electoral boundaries in the Province be brought in and made law." That was yesterday but the day before that or back last Friday the same opposition was standing in this legislature saying, "We do not want fifty-one seats, we only want forty-two." One of the passengers said to me, "What is the Liberal Party doing? Is this the kind of government they are going to give the Province of Newfoundland if they ever become the government? Are they going to make a decision one day and change it the next? Are they going to offer the mothers' allowances one day and say the next day, 'no, you are not going to get them.' Are they going to give us a large budget for roads one week and next week say, 'no, we are going to cancel it'."

That is the kind of hypocrisy we have been hearing in this House and it is over and over and over again.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: The fact is, Mr. Speaker, irrespective of where a member sits in this House of Assembly, if he is sitting as an independent, as a Liberal Party spokesman or a P.C. Party spokesman, the fact is that what we have now in this legislature is people standing in the House of Assembly and making absolute fools of themselves, changing their minds day after day, each day. The honourable member from Labrador South sits here as an independent member. I did not hear his speech but I heard the report of

part of it in the media. Obviously he said something and he is going to stand by it. I am sure he is not going to change his mind now. He made a decision yesterday. He is not going to change it again today. Surely he thought it out enough to know what he was doing when he made his decision on the resolution, what position he would take. He was not going to take it yesterday and change again today. That is what the official opposition in this House of Assembly is doing.

On December 5, an opposition amendment was brought in by the honourable gentleman from Bonavista North asking that there was be a new report, a further report setting forth the boundaries for forty-two electoral districts, each of which will return one member to the House of Assembly. That was on December 5, brought in by the official opposition in the House but yesterday, December 9, from the same official opposition, brought in this time in this case by the honourable gentleman from Twillingate, the resolution is asking the House of Assembly to adopt the official commission and to make fifty-one seats - No longer than a three day lapse, three day lapse.

Mr. Speaker, if I were sitting here

and was not paying attention to what was going on in the House. I would have to ask somebody in the House of Assembly or maybe the Speaker himself, what is going on? What are we voting on? Are we voting on fifty-two seats or fifty-one seats? Are we voting on forty-two seats? The honourable members on the opposition side are so confused, they just do not know what they are doing.

My suggestion, Mr. Speaker, in my few brief remarks on this amendment is this. I heard the comments of the honourable member for Bell Island on the Redistribution Bill. He stayed quite relevant but he also stayed quite within one area of the province. He only talked about one area, the area where he thought he might lose in the next provincial election.

Why was the honourable gentleman from White Bay North only concerned with Baie-Verte-White Bay? Because it is his district.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Why was the honourable gentleman from Bell Island so concerned about the Bell Island-Harbour Main District? Because it is his district.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Oh, yes!

Mr. Speaker, these are official Hansards, the debates of this House of Assembly. They prove what the honourable gentleman from White Bay North talked about. Over sixty-five per cent of his speech was - he is the Leader of the Opposition and he is trying to potentially become the Premier of the Province. God forbid! He spent over a two hour debate talking mainly about his own little riding, not about the boundaries in Labrador, not about the boundaries on the southern coast of the province but only within his own little parochial area.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: That is right. The honourable gentleman from Bell Island did the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable Leader of the Opposition, in his speech, December 2, from the highly, official Hansard debates, may I quote him: "Your Honour, we would find that when we spoke in the House in 1973, we said that we thought that the size of the House should be increased to fifty-one. We have changed our minds. We now think that fifty-one is too many. I said to the government that I implore them to change their minds on this issue. We think, Sir, that the House should be redistributed on the basis of forty-two seats and forty-two single members only." That was the honourable Leader of the Opposition, as we all thought on this side of the House, of Assembly, speaking the official policy of the Liberal Party on this Redistribution Bill.

To go on to quote the honourable Leader of the Opposition: "We do not need fifty-one M.H.A.'s. If we stick with forty-two we will have 13,000 people per member and that is lots." That is the quote from the honourable Leader of the Opposition. I go on in the same debate, the same gentleman: "Therefore, Mr. Speaker, (quoting the honourable Leader of the Opposition again) we think this House should have forty-two members only. We think forty-two is enough. One can differ, we all can differ but forty-two is sufficient for this House of Assembly." That is a quote from the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: "So I say to each member," the honourable Leader of the Opposition appealing to his own members, let alone appealing to us over here, "Mr. Speaker, let him stand and make his stand on the question of only one question, forty-two seats verses fifty-one." That was the honourable Leader of the Opposition, the honourable member for White Bay North speaking, asking his own members and asking all of us to stand only on forty-two. The issue was forty-two verses fifty-one. That was December 3.

Here we are now debating in the House of Assembly a resolution brought in by the same official opposition asking us to vote for fifty-one seats and to abide by the original report that was made by the commission. I would sincerely ask all members of the House of Assembly, particularly the members of the opposition - are they so confused. What is the official position of the Liberal Party? The people of Newfoundland I am sure are just as confused as we are over here. What is the official position of the Liberal Party? Do you want fifty-one seats or do you want forty-two seats? What do you want? Make it known! Make it clear to us. You might even get a vote from us over here on one of your amendments if you make it clear what you want.

MR. F. B. ROWE: On a point of order, please.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member is misrepresenting the words of the Leader of the Opposition.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. B. ROWE: Am I allowed to continue my point of order, Mr. Speaker?

The honourable member knows full well that there was a resolution brought in calling for the forty-two seats and it was ruled out of order. We have had to move another resolution asking for the best of two evils. He is deliberately misrepresenting the words of the honourable Leader of the Opposition. Besides that, he is quite irrelevant.

MR. MORGAN: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I am speaking on an amendment which we now have before the House of Assembly and I am comparing the amendment with the previous one, which was brought in by the same official opposition.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): Whether or not the honourable member had a point of order to be made, I suggest he has not made it. He has given his point of view on what the honourable member is saying. The honourable member may continue.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the fact that I did speak on the main resolution and expressed my views with regard to the Redistribution Bill,

I spoke in favour of it. The people in Bonavista Bay are in favour of it. I will call upon any member of this legislature who will submit any briefs, any petitions, any letters individually or petitions of any kind to this House of Assembly from Bonavista Bay protesting redistribution. I call upon them. I challenge them, if they have them, I know they have not got them.

Mr. Speaker, to get back to the amendment. The amendment does not make sense because the fact that the original bill asking for a royal commission to be appointed, the fact that piece of legislation was passed by this legislature prior to this bill now before the House and the fact that bill specifically states, that we can introduce the resolution to deal with the commission's report, to deal with it one of two ways, deal with the report as was presented and make the report become law, in other words, to implement the report for fifty-one boundaries as drawn up by the commission or part two, we can introduce a resolution to the House of Assembly with the report with alterations. We are dealing with that resolution based on that method. We are dealing with the report with alterations. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The honourable Member for St. John's North.

MR. J. A. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The debate has been very mild. I have not heard anyone's mother or father or sister abused. So I hope that the debate will continue in this high moral tone which it began.

The Member for St. Barbe North wondered why the members on this side were not speaking but I tried to make the point that it was because of the jack-in-the-box behaviour from the opposition side of the House, I do not know, is it, jacks-in-the-box or jack-in-the-boxes. I am not sure of the plural of that. But, however, we now have a chance to get up and have a few words.

The theme of my remarks in speaking to the amendment on this resolution, is that, it is very, very hard to redraw any electoral boundaries. Any electoral reform is complex and it is very often hard to distinguish

cases and effects when you are trying to implement some new policy. I certainly congratulate anyone who attempts to redistribute any electoral district. It has proven difficult in the past, it is difficult now and, I think, it will be difficult in the future.

Now, I think, it is relevant to discuss the problems that can arise from any redistribution, good or bad or indifferent. First of all, if you increase the number of seats, this increase is likely to be inflationary. I will return to that point later. If you change the boundaries obviously incumbents are going to be changed, even members if they are going to get re-elected. They are not running

in all of their old district. Whatever personal following they have evaporates. So this becomes an unknown factor and then you have to decide upon the size of the district, how much weight you should give to area and how much you should give to population. I myself feel that the criterion to follow is the ease of communication, both by car, boat or radio, television, the state of the communications in the area. By that yardstick it would be improper to bring out a district of Circular Road or a district of Rawlins Cross or to have a very large district of Noonan's Corner. This would be improper, it would not work out.

We could perhaps have a district of Robin Hood Bay. However, that seems to be well represented at the moment. Now, when this resolution was printed up and I glanced through it I saw reference made to a new district of Mount Scio. Now, Mount Scio is the name of our farm. It was the name of the property when it was first deeded. So I assumed that this was going to be a new district presumably carved out for myself. There are only three voters there. There is myself, my wife and my mother.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman would not stand a chance of winning though.

MR. CARTER: Well, that may well be. They know me too well. However, it would be extremely easy to canvass. The cost of running an election campaign there would be extremely cheap. But when I read a bit further I found that the district of Mount Scio was rather larger and rather different from what I had originally expected and again I will return to that point later.

Now, in redistributing you solve certain problems and one of the problems you solve is just the straightforward mathematical one. In other words you make sure that the will of the electorate either will or will not obtain. I think it is right and proper for any P.C. in this country to feel that if he runs as a member, as a candidate he has a reasonably even chance of getting in. That is to say if his campaign is good, if his programme is good that numerically if the voter turnout is even all across the Island that he and his party have a reasonable chance to get in and I think the same can be said for a Liberal. If a Liberal or any other party that is running, I think that they should expect that they have a reasonable

chance of getting in and forming a government if a majority of the electorate want to have that type of government.

The other problem that I think it solves or can solve is that of community of interest and I think that redistribution could foreshadow county development. One of the unfortunate things about Newfoundland is that we are deficient in the third level of government and I do not mean deficient in numbers of municipalities but in our municipal structure. Surely our municipal boundaries should be far wider and they should cover possibly as much area as an electoral district. This in itself, could over the years cause problems because one redistribution is not going to solve all of your problems for now and forever because populations move, people change from one area to another and if you are not going to have rotten borrows then you have to redistribute from time to time and find after a while your boundaries, your county boundaries and your electoral boundaries may no longer coincide.

One of the, in a very acute way, the modern African states have found that by drawing the boundary lines of a country around different tribes or people having different interests and different backgrounds, causes more problems than it solves. I think that this is a thing that should be looked at very carefully when you are drawing district boundaries.

Now, a lot has been said about gerrymandering in this debate

and I reject that charge and I will explain why. It is very hard to prove. In fact, it is impossible to prove. One could argue that the previous, or the map that we now operate under because this bill has not yet passed, the map that we now operate under, was the result of extensive gerrymandering. I have no doubt that in the past that might have been the aim and it may have succeeded. Certainly St. John's North, the district I represent now represents about 22,000 voters.

By the way, I wish in the future in this debate honourable gentlemen would either say when they are speaking of the number of people in their district or in the district under consideration, either that it is voting members or population. I think it is much better.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: For every two voters add three. So, it is about half as much again. Well, that is a good rule of thought.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: Well, I have always heard the figure three to two. I would stand to take correction. It would vary obviously from district to district. Certainly St. John's North has about 22,000 voters as near as I can calculate at present. By that yard stick I feel I should have three votes. If the House would like to entertain such a resolution at some future date, I will be more than happy to accommodate and each time I vote stand as three times instead of one. However, that is another point.

I think that those who argue that there is gerrymandering are missing to some extent, the point because the point is not how a thing is done, it is what is done. I do not care how the lines were drawn but I do care very much what lines were drawn. We hear talk that it may have been done in the dead of night by candlelight or lamplight or by no light. It may have been done by computer. It may have been done by an ass, who knows. That is not the subject under debate. That should not concern members here. What should concern us is the actual lines that are drawn. That is why I am using that comparison.

The other thing is that if you do set out to gerrymander, it could backfire. It could very well backfire. So, if you do decide to

gerrymander, you should not try to gerrymander too much, because you cannot predict the future on the basis of the past. Now that certain public figures have disappeared from the scene, I would say that the electoral polarization is going to be different.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: Well! Furthermore, splits have been a part of our history going back to 1832. It was always felt that one should accommodate the different groups within a district and different groups within a society. I often wondered if this did not tend to emphasize the fact that these divisions did exist in Quebec and in some Canadian politics on the Mainland. It is often popular to talk about the French as opposed to the English. Sometimes religious differences are used. I often feel that by consciously trying to accommodate these differences, you are accentuating them and perhaps even in some cases creating them.

The electoral divisions that we now operate under, I believe, were largely created by the felt need to cater to these differences. I think it was very unfortunate. I am certainly glad to see redistribution under act of consideration. Of course we have to talk about the method of bringing in any new programme. I am wondering to myself whether or not the comments from the other side of this House are hysterical or rancorous. I have not seen anyone foaming at the mouth, so I reject the idea that they are the result of hysteria. I do think that some of the remarks are the result of rancour and I think they are genuine rancour. I think they spring from the way that a great deal of legislation by necessity has to be done.

Now, there is a great deal of talk about the redistribution that was done by an independent commission and then representations were made to the commission

but unfortunately there was some input, everyone that appeared before that commission obviously their objections or approbation was taken into account but when drawing up the original boundaries, it was done by a very few. I do not care how respected a few they were, three or four people or even ten or twelve people are not wise enough to draw the kind of boundaries that will assure harmonious electoral procedures for the next twenty years. It is not just that easy. My own feeling is that it might have been better to have before the lines were drawn at all, before the map was redrawn to receive acres and acres of recommendations and somehow sift through those and try and come up with an acceptable arrangement.

One of the congressmen in the Southern States has found it useful to employ the services of a computer when trying to keep abreast of the opinions in his congressional districts. Now, of course, congressional districts are very large in the United States. His interests obviously would go far beyond his congressional boundaries but he has felt it necessary and useful to employ a computer. We cannot use horse and buggy methods for bringing in something that has to do us in the computer age.

Now speaking of the rancour that comes from the other side, I do feel no matter what is done now, it is any vote on this redistribution, is unlikely to be unanimous. Perhaps it cannot be and it may even be an election issue, and of course, I think, that would be a little absurd that this redistribution should be an election issue but it may well be, this debate is carrying on and on, and I think, the degree of rancour is possibly to increase.

I do think though that fifty-one seats can be viewed as inflationary. I do feel that the number of seats should be uneven because if they are even as they are now you can have a sawoff, you can have a split as we had in 1971. So I think the number of seats has to be uneven.

Now there are many factors outside the control of this House and this government, for example, the price of sugar, the price of grain,

the price of oil are all quite outside of our control but still there are some things within our control and we think we can do a little better, we can run a tight ship and set an example. So I do feel that fifty-one seats can be viewed as inflationary, but, of course, we are told that, that is not under debate because that has already been passed.

Now the ideal way of coming up with a map would be, in my view, piecemeal tinkering followed by very critical analysis of the various pieces that were brought in. There will always be mistakes that is a part of our heritage, that is a part of the way we work. Human beings make mistakes but, I think, they should try and keep them small and learn from them. It is impossible to learn from big mistakes because no one will admit them. It is very hard to be sure that the results of your measures tally with your good intentions. In other words, someone has to stop somewhere. We are under the effect of double digit inflation and, I think, we have to cut our garment according to our cloth. In other words, nothing exceeds like excess.

Now to get back to the District of Mount Scio. Very briefly the boundaries are in the south Elizabeth Avenue, in the west Thorburn Road, in the east Portugal Cove Road and in the north

the boundary cuts St. Phillips or Broad Cove in half and it cuts Portugal Cove in half. I think this is unfortunate, I think it is unnecessary and I am very sorry to say that I do not approve of it.

So, having said all that I have said, where do I stand? I do not approve of the amendment made by the opposition because this was occasioned by procedural gymnastics. They were not able to make an amendment that discussed the forty-two seats because that would be considered as negating the motion and therefore would not be allowed by the Speaker. Therefore, in order to have an amendment to continue addressing their remarks towards, they brought in the present amendment for fifty-one seats, saying that they should have the map suggested by the commission.

There is no question in my mind that the map under consideration by the main motion is better than the map that we now operate under. I will go even further and I will say that the map that is under consideration, suggested by the commission, that is the one under the amendment, is better than that again.

I object to the fifty-one seats. I think it should be forty-two or forty-three. I will go as high as forty-three and therefore I shall be voting against the amendment presented by the honourable Member for Twillingate and I serve notice that I will be voting against the main motion.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): The honourable Member for Labrador North:

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to hear the Member for St. John's North speak up against the resolution. Indeed the motion that I am speaking on now is no doubt the only motion that we could get on the floor of the House to debate at this particular time.

Before I go on, Mr. Speaker, let me get back to the remarks made by the honourable Member for Bonavista South. Apparently while the honourable member mentioned the fact that the opposition were wishy-washy and had changed their minds three times in the last two days, I would like to set the record straight by saying this is not true.

The honourable Member for Bonavista South is not understanding what he is hearing. If he is talking to people and prompting people to do something else or say something else in his favour, he should not pay any attention to what other people are saying.

The fact is, that yesterday this motion, no. (2) motion, to have forty-two seats in the House and redistribute the province on forty-two seats was turned down by the Speaker of the House. Therefore this motion could not be debated in this particular House on the grounds that it was ruled out of order by the Speaker. Now then, if the honourable Speaker would care to indicate to the House that he is now, after hearing what the Member for Bonavista South has said, that we can reintroduce that particular motion and he will rule it in order, then I am sure that my colleagues on this side of the House and the Member for St. John's North on the other side of the House, would take greater pleasure in speaking on this particular motion to have forty-two seats instead of the original resolution of fifty-one seats.

I feel it is inflationary to have fifty-one seats in this particular House and I feel that we do have sufficient representation with forty-two members.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order please! The honourable member is directed to the rule of relevancy. The amendment deals with the fifty-one seats not forty-two and the adoption of the commission's report.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The same rules of relevancy applies to the honourable Member for Bonavista South who went on to some great length in explaining the

resolution that was turned down by the honourable House yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, as each member spoke on this side of the House we did state that we do not agree with fifty-one seats. We do not agree with placing another quarter of a million or two hundred and sixty thousand dollars additional on the taxpayers of this province to elect an additional nine members to the House of Assembly. We made that quite clear. Then we moved the amendment that was turned down.

In order to debate this resolution further we have no choice, Mr. Speaker, but to put forth an amendment that would be allowed by the Speaker so that we could continue the debate in the House. While speaking on this resolution let me go back to the recommendations that were made by the Electoral Boundaries Commission. I would like to go back to the submissions that were made to the Premier or the Minister of Justice by the Electoral Boundaries Commission and signed by the four commissioners who were appointed to draft the recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, going back to the first map or the first recommendation, that was basically a trial map the commission took. They took a map, they had their geographer draw in fifty-one districts and then they set about to do their work in the province. What did they do? They set up a number of areas in the province so that they could go out and consult with the people, the electorate in the province so that they could get their ideas, recommendations and briefs as to how they should go about drawing up or redistributing the electoral districts in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

What did they do, Mr. Speaker? They held commission hearings in the following areas: Happy Valley, Labrador; Wabush, Labrador; Stephenville; Corner Brook; Bonne Bay; Port aux Basques; St. Anthony; Grand Falls; Gander; Glovertown; Clarenville; Marystown; Grand Bank; Burin; Harbour Grace; Placentia; Calvert and St. John's. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, looking at these particular areas that they got a very, very broad view on what the electorate in the province felt, and how they would recommend that the province be divided up.

At those hearings there were a number of people who did appear with written briefs. A number of the members on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, appeared at those hearings as well as some of my colleagues on this side of the House. The Member for Labrador South appeared at the hearings in Happy Valley. We had Mr. Hank Shouse, a member of the executive of the New Labrador Party appear in Happy Valley. We had Rev. Charles DeHarbeng an R.C. Parish Priest appear at the hearings in Happy Valley. He is a fine gentleman, Mr. Speaker, who contributed heavily to that particular area, who has compiled possibly more statistics on what has been happening in Labrador, can show more figures, than any of the politicians that we have today.

I myself appeared in Happy Valley at the Labrador North hearings. Gene Canning appeared at the Wabush hearings. Charlie Devine, who once sat in this House, Mr. Speaker, who knows the difficulty of playing politics in that mainland portion of the province, this vast area here, Mr. Speaker, and you will see that little island to the south of it, it is not in proportion to what is drawn on here, you will see a little island to the south that they call Newfoundland - this area is considered to be a part of the province which is called Labrador. Also,

Mr. Speaker, at that hearing Your honour appeared in Port au Port and no doubt you contributed greatly to the commission.

The Party Whip, the Tory Party Whip who is not in the House today and has not been around, the behaviour of the House has not been the same since, Mr. Speaker, that honourable crowd has become unruly since that Party Whip has disappeared from the ranks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. WOODWARD: We will welcome him back some day. Dr. Gordon Thomas Executive Director of the International Grenfell Association, who possibly has travelled more than most of us throughout Labrador, can understand conditions and I am sure can make recommendations on the practical sense of what should happen in Labrador, appeared in St. Anthony at the commission.

Dr. Noel Murphy who once represented that side of the House as the honourable Opposition Leader appeared in Corner Brook and contributed more I suspect than the Member for Bonavista South did contribute when he was making those false accusations in the House today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did not make any false accusations in this House and the honourable gentleman from Labrador North should retract that statement.

MR. WOODWARD: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker. He stated that we presented to the House an amendment, which was not done. If this is not considered to be a false accusation, what is a false accusation?

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order please! I think the member's choice of words is unfortunate. He may state that the honourable member may have been mistaken. It could be a matter of debate between two honourable members but the phrase "false accusations" is a -

MR. WOODWARD: Do you want me to withdraw it, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): I would suggest the honourable member might rephrase or preferably withdraw it.

MR. WOODWARD: I have no hesitation in withdrawing those remarks, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: It only appeared to be a false accusation.

MR. WOODWARD: It only appeared to be that.

Mr. Speaker, another person, Elmer Bursey the Mayor of Botwood appeared at the commission. John P. Curran of Gambo, Fred M. Tessier, Mayor of Grand Bank, appeared at the commission; Larry Hudson, the Mayor of Marystown, appeared at the commission; Tobias Matthews, Mayor of Fortune; getting close to the - Hubley Grandy, the Mayor of Garnish; Donald Hollett the Mayor of Burin, Miss Frances Marshall of Burin; Charles White, the secretary of the Community Council of Winterland; and the honourable Member for Placentia West, also appeared at that hearing. I am sure that he contributed heavily to the hearings.

But now, the Premier says to him; "Forget about it. Whatever you said, forget about it. I will have it the way I want it." If that is not gerrymandering, is not "Leomandering" is not "Johnnymandering" it is the way the Premier wants the thing done. The member for Bay de Verde appeared and Mr. Nash the Chairman of the Community Council of Branch. Joseph Careen, Michael Ryan the President of the P.C. Association of Ferryland who must be an honourable gentleman appeared at that hearing; the Reverend John D. Hanton, Parish Priest, Chairman of Renew's Parish Council, appeared there; William Morey President of the Royal Canadian Legion, Branch 34;

AN HON. MEMBER: Another good Liberal.

MR. WOODWARD: Garland Pittman Chairman of Renew's, Carl Sullivan President of the Southern Shore Physical Recreation Association and then again, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for Ferryland -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hurray!

MR. WOODWARD: Edward Horlick St. John's South; R.E. Fagan Q.C. Chairman of the Towns of Conception Bay South; John W. Mahoney Q.C. President of the Liberal Association of Newfoundland, a man of substance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hurray!

MR. WOODWARD: W.C. Horwood Town Clerk, Town of Point Leamington;

Bernice Corrigan Town Clerk of the Town of Trepassey; William Healey P.C. Association Harbour Main North;

AN HON. MEMBER: He was converted. He is going Liberal the next time.

MR. WOODWARD: That is right. Town Council of Catalina appeared; there was Phillip Jeddore the Vice President of the Native Association of Newfoundland and Labrador and there was another honourable gentleman who appeared, the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for White Bay North, at the commission.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hurray!

MR. WOODWARD: There was another honourable gentleman William N. Rowe of White Bay South; and there was another honourable gentleman the Member for St. Barbe North who appeared.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. WOODWARD: But the best of all, Mr. Speaker, was another honourable gentleman, his name is H.W.Cole the Chief Electoral Officer of the Province of Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying here is the -

MR. ROBERTS: Ha yes! That gentleman without be-stain or besmirch.

MR. MURPHY: If you had half his guts you would be all right.

MR. ROBERTS: If you had quarter of his brains you would be better off.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order please! Order please!

MR. WOODWARD: That is a pretty wide range -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order please! If honourable members would only speak a fraction of that which they do we would all be better off.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, what I would like to point out is this. The purpose of that particular commission was to make recommendations. The input into that commission from a very wide range of experienced people throughout this province, as the result of that they came up and recommended to government this particular map of redistribution which I feel is more sincere and relates more to the electorate in

this province than the third map that has been presented pertaining to the resolution that the Premier has introduced into this particular House.

I am very disturbed, equally as disturbed as my colleague from Labrador South because of the gerrymandering that has gone on with regard to the seats in Labrador. We had recommended to the commission and the commission felt that the recommendations that were put forward in Goose Bay had a lot of merit. They were backed up by people who had travelled broadly in that particular area of the province. The commission after looking at it came up with the recommendations that were put forward as a result of the hearings in Happy Valley and in Wabush.

Mr. Speaker, looking at it from this point of view, the seats were divided up accordingly as is seen on this map here; the Eagle River, the Naskaupi and the Menihek. Looking at that distribution, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:(Dunphy) Order please! If the honourable member would permit. I wonder if the gentlemen who are behind the Chair would remove themselves elsewhere? This way I can hear the debate. Thank you.

MR. WOODWARD: You are a good man, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, before I go on to show evidence of why the recommendations were submitted for those three particular seats and the portion that is going into the Straits Area, I would like to go back to the commission hearings and what was put forward in Happy Valley. It is generally known and we have evidence to support a number of things. Although the bill that was passed to set up the commission - you must first take Census Canada 1971 figures.

We have found and we have documented in Labrador a number of cases where Statistics Canada 1971 figures, when the last census were taken are understated. We have proof from community councils and even a letter from the census people in St. John's saying: 'Yes, we recognize the fact that there are more people in Labrador but we did not get around to seeing them all. When we did talk to a number

December 10, 1974, Tape 2032, Page 3 -- apb

of people, instead of saying they were from Happy Valley-Goose Bay, they said they were from Conception Bay, Harbour Main 'but we have lived in Happy Valley for the last ten or fifteen years.'" They were never from there.

That has lead to a number of incorrect census figures, if you want to call it that. Being concerned about representation and the redistribution of the Labrador seats, we set about to do

a survey, not a comprehensive survey but a survey by contacting different groups, community councils and compiling statistics. What happened in that particular case, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that Census Canada are telling us that in 1971, we had a total population in Labrador of some 20,000 people. When we look at our own survey to revise those figures, we came up with a population of over 35,000 people. If the Premier or the people on the government side of the House want to play fair ball with the residents of Labrador, I suggest that before we pass this resolution in this House that someone should set about to satisfy themselves or correct that inadequacy that exists in the population figures. We know for a fact that they are not true. We have had correspondence with a Mr. Hutchings who explains that the apparent discrepancies in the census figures for Labrador -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODWARD: In his letter, Mr. Hutchings stated that Happy Valley- Labrador City, particularly, the many people who live there give their place of residence as outside the area, at their former homes. This is one of the reasons for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when you look at those census figures and you take into consideration the population of 35,000 people, that indicates to us and it should also indicate to the government, that Labrador is not only entitled to three seats and a portion of the Straits of Belle Isle. Labrador is indeed entitled to four full seats and then we can be well within the quotient that is set by the Redistribution Bill. I can make recommendations, Mr. Speaker, as to how the people in Labrador would like to see this particular portion of the province divided up into four seats, four full seats. I will get around to the Straits of Belle Isle seat later.

What is recommended here and I can give figures, I can supply documents and give figures as to how this thing should be done. Mr. Speaker, if the government is naive enough to accept - I think the Minister of Justice today, when we talked of unemployment figures in the province, made some snide remarks as to how accurate Statistics Canada are. I think that was brought up later on during the question period.

We would like for the government now to take a very serious look, Mr. Speaker, at not distributing Labrador on the basis of three and one-half seats but revising the population figures and doing it on four seats.

The first recommendation, Mr. Speaker, is that the four districts should be as follows: Labrador South, from L'Anse-au-Clair through to Cartwright that is presently now the seat that the honourable Member for Labrador South represents, this particular area, although it only has a population of 4,000 to put that well within the quotient, be joined with the Communities of Northwest River and Goose Bay. Looking at those figures here, Mr. Speaker, you will be looking at a figure well within the quotient

of 8,417 that gives you your number one seat for Labrador. Taking number two seat you will take the Community of Happy Valley, if you are looking for population figures, the Community of Happy Valley, Mud Lake, the north Labrador Coast from Rigolet to Nain and you will come up with a figure of 8,417 people, which is quite a coincidence but that is the way it is done.

Wabush/Churchill Falls and part of Labrador City, you can have a population in here, you can divide it into two seats. You can take the Wabush/Labrador City and a portion of Churchill Falls and you can get 8,355 for the remaining fourth seat, Mr. Speaker, You can take the remaining portion of the City of Labrador City and you will come up with a population of 9,500 people. So when you look at those four seats, you are looking at a high seat of 9,500 approximately and the other is well within the range. You have seats in the province of 8,400.

So if this government wants to give adequate representation to this particular area or the breadbasket of this province, which they are so anxious to develop and get portions of that resource down to the island - maybe this is significant when you look at the names that have been placed on those rivers, Mr. Speaker. Maybe they had that plot in mind. We can only seek power and something to extract something from it, like the Eagle River, maybe one day we will develop the power there and we will bring it down to the island and then that Eagle name will become synonymous with the Island of Newfoundland. It is not very synonymous with that particular portion of the district now. Neither is the name of Naskaupi which is the only river that has been restricted to some degree flowing into Northwest River or into the Grand Lake. It has been restricted by the Sail Lake dyking on the Churchill Falls Development - is a very small river but very few people outside of the Northwest River Area know anything about it. If you want to refer to it as the Naskaupi tribe or tribe of Indians by the name of Naskaupi then this does not give any significance to it because we do not have any Naskaupi Indians.

I am sure that many actions in the west- the people in Labrador City who have known Labrador City, Carol Lake, Wabush, Twin Falls or whatever the case may be, would probably feel better by having a name that is synonymous with the development rather than having a lake that is remote and isolated and do not relate to that particular area.

Mr. Speaker, for that particular reason, I would like to see the government take this particular bill that is before the House now, say to some of their senior officials get us the right census on the Labrador population and then let us give Labrador a break for once and divide that particular area into four seats. That would be the right and just thing to do. If they fail to do that, Mr. Speaker, what is recommended here is half presentable but what the government are recommending on this particular resolution is not at all presentable to the people or do not represent the people in that particular area.

We have seen headlines in the paper of "Labrador Concerns Ignored". We know that is a fact, that it went on for a number of years. We have heard words of separatism which we know is a fact but very few people mention the real problems that exist in this portion of the province. Very few people mention isolation problems,

people being locked in for long periods of time. No one is offering a solution to those particular problems.

Mr. Speaker, when the Premier first started to introduce the resolution in the House one of his key words was community of interest. He started with the Labrador seats. He said, "There is a community of interest between the north of Lake Melville and south of Lake Melville." I would like to show where that community of interest exists. I will tell you. Community of interest: Goose Bay, Happy valley - everything here relates to Goose Bay. When you go north to the district which is now known as Goose Bay, Happy Valley, Labrador North you will have to deal with five communities along the coast plus the fact that you go to a remote radar station at Saglek where we have twenty-one people employed and maybe ten or fifteen of those are working with an honourable company from the United States called ITT.

I am sure that when we think in terms of the gerrymandering and skulduggery and other things that went on in the United States and when we talk of ITT, maybe it relates to this particular problem that we are having with the gerrymandering that is going on here today. I will tell you we have - the community of interest that lies here in Goose Bay, Happy Valley is related to the northern communities. We take the community of Nain and we take the community of Davis Inlet which has an Indian population, we will take Hopedale, we will take Davis Inlet, we will take Makkovik and Postville - these are five communities along the north coast - and how they relate to the communities of Happy Valley, Goose Bay and why we suggested that this should be done here.

To start with, in Northwest River we have a school dormitory where all the students from those five communities and indeed it applies to some of the communities in the south too, when they read a Grade VIII are brought into that community for highschool. They go from Grade VIII to highschool in Northwest River. That is a community of interest because I am sure that this population, forty or fifty students who moved in from here - this has been going on for a long period of time - has the real community of interest with the community of Northwest River.

The trades school that was opened up in Happy Valley going back just two years ago, now doing a good job, is attracting students from this area as well into that particular school. So, that in itself is a community of interest.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes, but not as much - the west are going down to the island but the communities are coming into Goose Bay, Happy Valley. This is the community of interest.

The Minister of Education wanted me to get into that. I can explain how the people in Labrador West feel about our vocational school in Happy Valley. We can go on to the integrated school board. The board that runs those particular schools along the coast is in Happy Valley, Goose Bay. That indeed is another community of interest.

The medical headquarters that serves the population and runs three particular nursing stations on that particular part of the coast - the community of interest is the headquarters and a referral hospital in Northwest River. That is another community of interest.

The IGA headquarters which does more than the medical service and the medical officer for the north is Dr. Paddon who is also stationed in Northwest River. We also have an air ambulance service that is operated by the IGA that goes to the north and also to the south but to the north primarily and that is stationed in Northwest River.

The telephone company, the honourable Newfoundland Telephone Company - the operators -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Honourable?

MR. WOODWARD: I say honourable. I will have some choice words for the telephone company later on in the House because of the increased rates in telephone service. That in itself is stationed here and you have to go through a Goose Bay operator to get to any of the coastal communities through VHF radio or HF radio.

The regional welfare supervisor has his office in Goose Bay, Happy Valley. The regional health inspector has his office in Goose Bay, Happy Valley. The banking centres where people bank is in Goose

December 10, 1974

Tape 2035

IB-3

Bay, Happy Valley. The magistrate who works for the honourable
Minister of Justice, his home is in Happy Valley and he serves both
the north and the south. So, it is a community of interest along here.
The law is enforced

from Goose Bay-Happy Valley. If there is a prisoner brought in from the coast or detained, he has to come through Goose Bay-Happy Valley. The R. C. M. P., NGOYC are stationed in Goose Bay-Happy Valley. The R. C. Church has four priests now stationed in Happy Valley and they do periodic business to the coast. That indeed is another community of interest. The Labrador Services Division, which is federally funded, now have a big office and a big home in Happy Valley. The wildlife officer, who serves this particular area - I will relate one thing, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted.

Mr. Speaker, the only community of interest that lies south of here and north of here into that particular area, it is not flowing from northeast to west in this particular area, it is flowing from west to east, is that there is a very large herd of caribou in this particular area. The only interest that the people have here in this particular area is the fact that they would like to have the boundaries extended up here so that they can have a number of people travel into the Nain, David's Inlet Area to hunt caribou, which we have disallowed and I think rightfully so. This is the only interest we have in this respect.

The Mozavian Mission have their superintendent stationed in Happy Valley. The Federal Fisheries Protection Officer has his home and is stationed in Happy Valley. This is another community of interest. The Canadian Manpower Centre is stationed in Happy Valley. This is another community of interest. The terminals for Labrador Airways that operate a subsidized service, east and west, all flights originate out of Goose Bay-Happy Valley. That is indeed another community of interest.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODWARD: EPA, if you want to get through to the mainland or through to the island, it only makes one stop here, Mr. Speaker. It does not go to the coast or any other area just Goose Bay. That is another community of interest.

Terminal Port Goose Bay for Montreal shipping, comes around during the summertime into Goose Bay and all goods are reshipped along the coast from that particular area. Goose Bay is now offering a large retail centre. It is attracting a number of people because we only have government stores in this area in which the people can do their shopping. They fly in during Christmas time, Easter time and that is another community of interest.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODWARD: Almost definitely.

Another community of interest, Mr. Speaker - and the honourable Premier stated, while he was introducing the resolution in the House, that this is one of the potential growth areas. This area will probably bloom into being something like nothing else in this province. This area attracts a lot of our young people who move in to get jobs, both from the north and from the south and they settle into this particular area.

Now, I want to point that out to the - I am sorry that the Premier is not in the House today -

MR. MARTIN: To a point of order please.

My honourable friend from Labrador North is making some very good points and I think he should be given the courtesy of being heard in silence. It seems that the honourable gentlemen on the other side are ignoring this point again once more.

MR. SPEAKER(Mr. Dunphy): The honourable gentleman's point is well-taken. I suggest that the honourable member for Labrador North be heard in silence.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear! Hear!

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This as it relates in the practical sense, not in the sense that the government or the honourable ministers on the other side of the House see it, because it does not relate to them, because it is isolated, they do not see it - it is not there, they have not lived there, they have no feeling for it. It is a real gut issue with people who have

to deal with it on a day to day basis. For that particular reason, Mr. Speaker, and those reasons also apply, not to the extent that they do in the north,

but to a great extent to one of the biggest centres in the south, when you take the Cartwright Area. The community of interest between Cartwright and Goose Bay/Happy Valley goes back a little bit deeper than trades and communications because a large portion of the population have moved from there and have settled and lived for a number of years in Happy Valley. If I wanted to quote statistics on travel, I venture to say that the heaviest travelled area in the whole of Labrador is people travelling from the Community of Goose Bay/Happy Valley into Cartwright, from one area to another. This is the community of interest. This is a great community of interest.

As you move along, the community of interest lessens somewhat but then again we have our schools and we have a number of people that relate to that particular area. So what is the sensible thing to do when you are making a recommendation? We made the recommendation on the basis that through the royal commission and we were - that the Communities of Happy Valley, although there is one area that can be considered as an industrial area, if you want to call it that, and one is an urban area where people live. But why not split those two areas so that we can develop that community of interest with the coastal community. Instead of going around with the original recommendation and the recommendation that is contained in this particular resolution, that you go with one member from Smith's Harbour to Nain, covering a - I wish I had a map in proportion to what the Island portion is, Mr. Speaker, that I could indeed show you that this area from here, when you are talking in terms of 800 miles, could stretch all the way from Port aux Basques to St. John's.

MR. ROBERTS: No, more than that 'Mel', it is only 300 miles from St. John's to St. Anthony.

MR. WOODWARD: More than that. Could stretch that total area. Now then the Premier sees fit to stick a member, not that there would not be people volunteer to serve in that area - I have quite an affection and a feeling for that area, and I would venture to serve myself today if I thought I could do it justice but you cannot do a justice. There

is no way that you can travel that area to do it justice. One says, okay you can join a coastal boat here, you can go into Goose Bay, you can drink it up at the clubs in Goose Bay and stay overnight as the boats normally do and then you can go north to the district.

Mr. Speaker, in that area, to include that total area you are looking at ten permanent communities in the south, you are looking at six communities, which are sixteen communities in the north, which during the summertime expands into fishing communities and you have more than thirty communities strung along this particular portion of that coast. Now how are you going to do it? How are you going to travel, tell me that?

I made one particular trip here which is the most economical way to do it, to do my district is by coastal boat. I made a trip in November, there is no possible way that you can do justice to a district by travelling on a coastal boat. A coastal boat travels twenty-four hours a day, you may be arriving in Mary's Harbour at two o'clock in the morning and leaving again at four o'clock in the morning with a whistle stop of two hours. You cannot serve your district that way. The way that I serve my district is to do it like this, I charter an aircraft, which costs me \$480 per day, out of Goose Bay. I leave Goose Bay in the morning, on the first day, I fly into the Community of Postville and I spend the morning and a part of the afternoon in that particular area, then I leave there and I fly into Nain, I stay overnight in the Community of Nain, which is 380 miles away. I spend the night in Nain, I fly back the next morning to the Community of Davis Inlet, I spend a couple of hours there and then I fly into Hopedale and spend the afternoon in Hopedale and overnight in the Community of Makkovik and the next day I fly back into Goose Bay depending on the weather conditions at the time. So this is a period of two and a-half to three days. So it is not difficult to calculate the cost. I make a visit to my district every second month by that means by chartering

December 10, 1974

Tape 2037

PK - 3

an aircraft which costs in the vicinity of some where around \$1,300
for that particular trip.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

You have to do a good job. My conscience dictate that I do a good job and I get very disturbed when my honesty falls on deaf ears when I am trying to do something to improve this particular situation here. By making those recommendations there is no way, there is no just way that you are going to improve those conditions. You are making them worse. You are compounding them by somewhere around ten to fifteen or twenty times. Now, say for instance the same thing applied in your bigger centres, you want to overnight, you want to overnight in Cartwright, you want to overnight in Mary's Harbour, you want to overnight in Charlottetown and you want to overnight in Mary's Harbour, so you took four stops here for four days and you took three stops here for seven days. Now you calculate the cost of an aircraft to that particular area. How do you do it?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WOODWARD: Sure.

DR. FARRELL: How many thousands in the run of a year for a two month visit?

MR. WOODWARD: It cost me?

DR. FARRELL: Yes, six trips a year.

MR. WOODWARD: It cost me between \$4,000 and \$5,000 a year, just transportation only.

DR. FARRELL: Sir, I thought he said -

MR. WOODWARD: I do six trips a year.

DR. FARRELL: \$1,700 -

MR. WOODWARD: \$1,200 to \$1,300 a trip.

DR. FARRELL: Well, that is \$7,000 or \$8,000.

MR. WOODWARD: \$7,000 to \$8,000, yes.

DR. FARRELL: I was just wondering that is all. It is a huge sum of money out of your salary.

MR. WOODWARD: If you have to do justice to this particular area then you have to add on another four days because the area is much larger.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WOODWARD: So what happens in this case here? Basically what you are doing.

you are spending a - and in order to do that service you cannot do it. The distance is too great to travel by service transportation. It would literally take you, to travel from here to here by ski-doo it would take you a full winter, a full winter.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: To make one trip?

MR. WOODWARD: To make one trip. By tanker it will take you two weeks. In the meantime you deliver 180,000 gallons - - (Inaudible) - and you make a few bucks. Mr. Speaker, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WOODWARD: When you look at this particular situation here and look at how ridiculous it is to suggest that this be done, I suspect that the government, the government is not naive enough to put the residents that have been so neglected over the years under pressure to have one particular member to service that total area. Now, a compromise as I stated before would be to divide. There is nothing wrong with having three members here, there is nothing wrong with having two members in Goose Bay sharing the coastal responsibility. When we suggested that to the royal commission they recommended to us: They said we did not know a way around it but this is a way around it. There is nothing wrong with dividing Goose Bay Happy Valley up and having two members, one going north, one going south. Then you can give adequate representation to the area. I would like to see four seats in Labrador as I recommended first. That should be done.

MR. ROBERTS: Move the adjournment or we are going to be here tonight.

MR. WOODWARD: I move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): I believe the honourable member's forty-five minutes expires at practically this time. Maybe the honourable member wishes somebody else to move the adjournment.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): I believe the honourable member's time is up and I am informed by the gentlemen at the Table.

December 10, 1974.

Tape 2038

RH - 3

MR. ROBERTS: It is up to somebody else to move the adjournment.

MR. M. MARTIN: I will move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow.

Wednesday, December 11, 1974 at 3:00 p.m.